

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOx 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,258	01/31/2002	Margnus Ljungstrom	HO-P02314US1	2268
26271 7:	590 11/29/2005		EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT	& JAWORSKI, LLI	SNAY, JEFFREY R		
1301 MCKINN	IEY			
SUITE 5100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOUSTON, TX 77010-3095			1743	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/062,258	LJUNGSTROM ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jeffrey R. Snay	1743			
The MAILING Period for Reply	S DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHICHEVER IS LC - Extensions of time may be after SIX (6) MONTHS from If NO period for reply is sepailure to reply within the Any reply received by the	ATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY ONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA e available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 om the mailing date of this communication. pecified above, the maximum statutory period v set or extended period for reply will, by statute, office later than three months after the mailing transt. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133)			
Status			·			
1) Responsive to	communication(s) filed on 15 Se	eptember 2005.				
/ ` <u>—</u> / \ · ·	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this app	• •					
closed in acco	ordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	i3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			•			
4) Claim(s) 1,3,4	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,4,7-13 and 21-28</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s)	_ is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>, 3,</u> 4	Claim(s) <u>, 3, 4, 7-13 and 21-28</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
7) Claim(s)						
8) Claim(s)	are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers	¥		•			
9) The specificati	on is objected to by the Examine	r.⊹				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce		Examiner.			
	not request that any objection to the					
	rawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11)☐ The oath or de	eclaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgm	ent is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
	ome * c)⊡ None of:	. ,				
1. ☐ Certifie						
	d copies of the priority documents		on No			
3. Copies	of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage			
applica	tion from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attache	ed detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.			
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References C Notice of Draftsperson 	Cited (PTO-892) 's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Information Disclosure Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		latent Application (PTO-152)			
	 ·	٠, 🗀 ٥٣،٥٠٠				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gordon ('577).

Gordon discloses an optical analysis apparatus which clearly includes all of the presently recited elements. Referring to Figure 6, Gordon teaches the device including a rotatable disc holder (44), which is formed of plastic (column 5, line 1), a detector head (46), and a controller (49) for controlling positioning and operation of both the rotating disc and the detector head. The disc is rotated via a spindle motor (47) and the detector head is moved step-wise via a stepper motor (48) (see column 8, last paragraph). The device of Gordon further includes an angular aligning system in the form of black bar (50) and a radial aligning system in the form of the disc edge (see column 9, first and second paragraphs). In operation, the black bar is sensed by the detector head to indicate a calibrated home angular position and the disc edge is sensed to indicate a calibrated home radial position. Subsequently, the controller and computer elements are capable of tracking relative movements of the detector head and disc such that precise determination of the position of the light source/detector

Art Unit: 1743

arrangement relative to the disc is enabled (column 9, lines 21-24). In a similar but alternative embodiment, such positioning with respect to the surface of the disc, and consequently the samples located thereon, is provided by integrating digital encoding structures on the disc which are detected and interpreted by the detector (column 6, lines 20-32).

Regarding instant claim 3, Gordon discloses the use of laser light source (8) and acknowledges the application to measuring fluorescence (column 1, 3d paragraph). Regarding instant claim 4, see Gordon at column 8, 3d full paragraph). Regarding instant claims 5 and 6, it is noted that the relative coverage of the detection area would be entirely dependant on one's definition of the detection area. Thus, Gordon teaches coverage of at least one detection area defined as a single sample, and also teaches coverage of only a part of the detection area defined as the whole disc. Regarding instant claim 12, Gordon teaches the calibration mark (50) as being black. It is noted that instant claim 12 does not preclude the presence of other materials which are not black. Regarding instant claim 13, Gordon teaches that detection agents are immobilized at different locations of the disc, including electrophoretic gels. Since the claim fails to define any particular flow conditions, and the substances in Gordon are immobilized throughout the operation of the device, it must be concluded that the limitation of instant claim 13 is fully satisfied by the Gordon device.

Response to Arguments

Application/Control Number: 10/062,258

Art Unit: 1743

3. Applicant's arguments filed 09-15-05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Gordon does not teach the presently recited microchannel structure or an entirely black disk. The argument is not persuasive because Gordon teach tracks of eletrophoretic gel for transporting samples, which gel would have constituted microchannel structures. Furthermore, the instant claims to not require the "entire" disk to be black.

Page 4

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Snay whose telephone number is (571) 272-1264. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 1743

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffrey R. Snay Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743 Page 5